

PACIFIC TRIAL ATTORNEYS  
A Professional Corporation  
Scott J. Ferrell, Bar No. 202091  
sferrell@pacifictrialattorneys.com  
4100 Newport Place, Ste. 800  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
Tel: (949) 706-6464  
Fax: (949) 706-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

SONYA VALENZUELA, individually and  
on behalf of all other similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

HOMAGE, LLC, an Ohio entity d/b/a  
HOMAGE.COM,

Defendants.

Case No. 8:23-cv-01601-JWH-AS  
Judge: Hon. John W. Holcomb

**NOTICE OF DISMISSAL WITH  
PREJUDICE PURSUANT TO  
FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL  
PROCEDURE 41(a)(1)(A)(i)**

1 TO THE COURT, CLERK AND ALL PARTIES OF RECORD, please take  
2 notice that Plaintiff Sonya Valenzuela (“Plaintiff”) hereby dismisses the instant action  
3 against Defendant Homage, LLC (“Defendant”) pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(i) of the  
4 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure *with prejudice* as to the Plaintiff’s individual claims,  
5 and *without prejudice* as to the putative class.

6 Pursuant to Rule 23(e), “the district court should inquire into possible prejudice  
7 from (1) class members’ possible reliance on the filing of the action if they are likely to  
8 know of it either because of publicity or other circumstances, (2) lack of adequate time  
9 for class members to file other actions, because of a rapidly approaching statute of  
10 limitations, (3) any settlement or concession of class interests made by the class  
11 representative or counsel in order to further their own interests.” *Diaz v. Trust*  
12 *Territory of the Pacific Islands*, 876 F.2d 1401, 1408 (9th Cir. 1989).

13 In this instance, the *Diaz* factors weigh in favor of dismissal of Plaintiff’s  
14 individual claims with prejudice. First, it is the Plaintiff’s counsel’s understanding that  
15 this action has not been publicized in any way and as such, the putative class members  
16 are highly unlikely to have knowledge of it, or to have relied upon it in any way.  
17 Similarly, Plaintiff’s counsel is unaware of any other circumstances that may have led  
18 to the putative class’s knowledge of, or reliance upon, this action.

19 Second, the statute of limitations in this action is not approaching. Plaintiff’s  
20 claims arose in March 2023 and as such, based on the four-year statute of limitations  
21 alleged in this action, the statute of limitations shall not run until March 2027. As such,  
22 the rights of the putative class are preserved by the solely individual dismissal of  
23 Plaintiff’s claims with prejudice.

24 Lastly, Plaintiff and her counsel made no settlement or concession of class  
25 interests in order to resolve Plaintiff’s individual claims. Indeed, the resolution reached  
26 between the Parties does not address, affect, or change the putative class’s rights or  
27 claims in any manner.

1 An evaluation of the foregoing *Diaz* factors weigh in favor of dismissal of  
2 Plaintiff's individual claims with prejudice, and dismissal of the putative class's claims  
3 without prejudice.

4 Respectfully submitted,

5  
6 Dated: October 12, 2023

PACIFIC TRIAL ATTORNEYS, APC

7 By: /s/ Scott J. Ferrell

8 Scott. J. Ferrell

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on October 12, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing  
**NOTICE OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE PURSUANT TO FEDERAL  
RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 41(a)(1)(A)(i)** with the Clerk of the Court using the  
CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing via electronic mail to all  
counsel of record.

/s/ Scott J. Ferrell  
Scott J. Ferrell